

The Sun.

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1896.

Subscription by Mail Post-Paid.
DAILY, Per Month, \$3.00
SUNDAY, Per Month, \$1.00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Month, \$4.00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year, \$48.00
Postage to Foreign Countries added.
THE SUN, New York City.

Local News.—The City and Suburban News Bureau of the United Press and New York Associated Press is at 21 and 23 Nassau street. All information and documents for public use instantly disseminated to the press of the whole country.

Let Speaker Reed Alone!

THE HON. THOMAS BRACKETT REED may be found on every business day at his regular place of business, attending conscientiously to the duties with which he has been charged by the Fifty-fourth Congress. There are multitudinous matters awaiting him, enough to make a man of any ordinary capacity to make a stupid man nervous. In addition to his ordinary functions as presiding officer of the House of Representatives, Mr. REED is compelled by circumstances to handle that hardest of subjects, an unwieldy partisan majority, composed of Republicans of widely different notions and interests, and including a large proportion of new members fresh from grass and frisky as young colts.

This is an enormous job, even for a statesman who is not also a candidate. Speaker REED faces it with his accustomed tranquillity of demeanor. Singly responsible for the preservation of Republican harmony in Congress in the year of a Presidential election, and for the maintenance of the interests of the whole party against factional feuds or individual ambitions, he stands there at the desk a rather noble and majestic figure, his upper lip bared to the fury of the storm.

This aspect of Mr. REED's candidacy is overlooked by our esteemed Republican contemporaries. The Speaker's position is in one important respect quite different from that of any of his competitors for the Republican nomination. They are free, most of them, to devote their undivided energies to the furtherance of their personal conceptions. They don't have to attend to the common cause. But he is loaded with their interests as well as his own. MORTON and MCKINLEY, and ALLISON and QUAY all depend upon him. Mr. THOMAS BRACKETT REED holds the House of Representatives in his hand, to keep all the Republican Congressmen in line, to suppress the feuds and the light-heads, and to wind up the session in a manner conducive to Republican success at the polls next November.

Mr. REED, as Speaker, therefore, is not merely the representative of Mr. REED's canvass for the Presidential nomination. He is also the Trustee of the fortunes and hopes of MCKINLEY, MORTON, QUAY, ALLISON, and all the rest, if others there be. If the Speaker should devote too much thought to matters personal to himself, and too little attention to the general welfare of the party, and a crash and catastrophe should occur in his department of Republican politics, of how much value in November would be the nomination obtained in June by Mr. MORTON, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. ALLISON, Mr. QUAY, or any other champion of the party?

Probably the Hon. THOMAS BRACKETT REED foresaw the altruistic responsibilities which his election as Speaker would thrust upon him, and accepted them in his large, serene way with his eyes fully open to their inconvenient character, considered from the point of view of mere selfish ambition. If he had been less of a Republican and more of a REED man, we can well understand that he would have allowed some other fellow to wear himself out in the Speaker's chair for the sake of Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. QUAY, Mr. MORTON, and Mr. ALLISON.

Under these circumstances we regard as particularly ungrateful and ungrateful the persistent attempts of the promoters of rival ambitions to force the Speaker to commit himself on this issue, in the hope of damaging him as a candidate. And the report that while the Hon. THOMAS BRACKETT REED is at his post in Washington, looking after the interests of his rivals equally with his own, the friends of Major MCKINLEY, for example, are endeavoring to break into and loot Mr. REED's modest little private collection of Southern delegates, is too hideous to be believed.

Russia and Japan.

It was but the other day, in discussing the latest treaty between China and Japan, which embodied the retrocession of Port Arthur to the former power, that we pointed out that it portended the substitution of Russian for Japanese ascendancy in Korea. The irrepressibility of the conflict of Japanese and Russian interests in the Hermit Kingdom has been proved sooner than we expected. By the Japanese Ministers known to be friendly to Japan, and by the equally significant fact that the King of Korea has sought an asylum in the Russian Legation at Seoul.

The tragedy which took place the other day in the Korean capital is the sequel of the murder of the Queen, who was a woman of strong prejudices and of energetic character, and who had been long recognized as the real head of the Min or anti-Japanese faction. The Japanese Minister at Seoul was accused of complicity in the crime, and although he has been acquitted, the verdict has been commonly regarded as one of not proven rather than of not guilty, because the act was perpetrated by tools of the pro-Japanese party, and was notoriously in its interest. It was only with extreme reluctance that the King, after his wife's death, acquiesced in the blackening of her memory on the charge of treasonable practices, and he is believed to have avenged her by authorizing the popular outbreak of which some of his Ministers have now been made the victims. The King knows himself to be an object of suspicion to the Japanese and to their sympathizers, is clear from his taking refuge in the house of the Russian envoy, which was promptly provided with a guard of Russian sailors and marines.

The gravity of the crisis caused by this incident was forthwith recognized at Tokio, and the sitting of the Japanese Parliament was suspended, in order, doubtless, to leave the Mikado question by itself, and to avert a trial of strength with Russia, which at present Japan is ill prepared. The ironclads which during the last year and a half have been collected at Vladivostok, and which in number, strength of armor, and weight of armament constitute a naval force superior to the existing sea power of Japan, are now stationed in an ice-free Chinese harbor at no great distance from Japanese and Korean waters. It would scarcely be practicable for the Mikado to place any considerable body of soldiers in the Hermit Kingdom, unless his Admirals should first win a naval victory

over the Russians, an event which is to say the least, improbable. The Czar's Generalissimo, on the other hand, could reach Korea by land from Vladivostok, where a large body of troops have been concentrated.

As things are, therefore, Russia would have Japan at a disadvantage, even if the contest were confined to a duel between the two powers for the possession of the Korean peninsula. This, however, would not be the case. The Czar is sure of the cooperation of China, whatever that may be worth, because the Pekin Government is his debtor for money lent and for the retrocession of Port Arthur, and because it would be glad of a pretext for evading payment of the unliquidated part of the indemnity promised to Japan. But we have not yet summed up the reasons for believing that the Mikado's advisers will be wise to renounce Korea without a fight. The close relations known to exist between the St. Petersburg and Paris Governments render it almost certain that the French fleet in the far East would be arrayed upon the Russian side, should the Japanese commit the blunder of provoking a naval war. The Mikado can hope for no help from Germany, which combined with Russia and France to compel him to evacuate the Liau-Tung peninsula; nor is there any ground for supposing that Great Britain will at this late date abandon her programme of neutrality.

There seems to be nothing for the Mikado to do but to give up the dream of exercising ascendancy in Korea which has been cherished by his subjects for so many centuries, and which was the principal incentive of the recent war with China. The Hermit Kingdom is manifestly destined to undergo a Russian protectorate, like the Khanates of central Asia. Such an outcome of the existing circumstances must be recognized as inevitable by far-seeing men at Tokio, but they also know that the war party, already exasperated by the retrocession of Port Arthur, will be excited to fury by the loss of Korea, and may organize an insurrection dangerous to the chiefs of the present Japanese Government, if not to the Mikado himself.

For some time to come the attention of the world is likely to be once more fastened on events in the far East.

An Impossible Condition.

If British public sentiment is adequately represented by the British press, the road is still long to the only possible method of settling the Venezuela dispute with peace, justice, and honor.

We find the London *Daily News*, an opponent of Lord Salisbury in politics, and a friend to America in days gone by, declaring that "the whole country would, we hope, welcome from Mr. BALFOUR an announcement of general arbitration, with a proviso that, in the event of the award going against us, England should purchase the settled districts." That is an impossible condition, because, on its face, it would permit the extension of British territory in this hemisphere. Yet even Liberal newspapers in England are still clinging to that condition, and the *News* declares that a vote of the House of Commons for Mr. ATHERLEY JONES's motion, which favored arbitration without conditions, would have been "unpatriotic and absurd."

This illustrates just how far we still are from a peaceful settlement of this controversy. Newspapers of Salisbury's political hue have Lord Salisbury harping on the same string of keeping the settled districts at all hazards. And what is meant by settlement is to be left to England, which, through the wrongful establishment of any outpost in Venezuelan territory, is to acquire the right to miles and leagues of unpenetrated tropical jungle lying between that outpost and British Guiana. Yet even this is not the main point. No such acquisition can hold good against the Monroe doctrine. British settlement, as the condition of arbitration, is no less impossible than the line of SCHOMBURGK, which is already numbered among things of the past.

What would the London *News* think of a Venezuelan proposal of arbitration, on condition that, should the award go against her, she should buy the districts declared by the London *News* to be settled? The settlement of British subjects on Venezuela is so small a thing that it is almost laughable to think of it. It is the event of the award going against us, "is what clouds the prospects of peace. Yet peace will not be doubtful, if Americans hold together with a determination no less dogged, that settlers or no settlers, England shall not have one inch of land on our continents about which we belong to her.

England's Many Brolls.

Two months ago, at the height of our trouble with England over the Venezuelan question, we heard a great deal about England's warlike preparations in Canada, from Quebec to Vancouver, and in her islands near the American seaboard, from Newfoundland to the Antilles. We took occasion, at that time, to give some account of these unusual preparations.

But now, when England was engaged against Germany, we heard much about her plans for thrashing the short-legged Kaiser. The first flying squadron was got in readiness to drive Germany from the high seas, and then the second flying squadron was got ready to assist the first. There was immense activity at the arsenals, and the naval shipyards, and the London music halls, and the Admiralty, and the offices of the *Times*, the *Telegraph*, the *Field*, and *Punch*.

Now, once more, when England and the South African Republic are harassing each other, we have news of England's warlike energy. We have learned from a London despatch of the United Press that the War Office has made every preparation to send a corps of 20,000 men to the South African Republic of that continuous Dutch Boer, President S. J. PAUL KRUGER, ordinarily called Oom Paul.

It may thus be seen that England has been engaged in three debates with other countries this winter, and that she always gets ready for war when any debate assumes an aspect of gravity.

Luckily for her, she has recently closed up two other debates without bloodshed. One of them she held with the Sultan of Turkey, and, in that case, she made a naval "demonstration" very near Constantinople, in the company of Russia, France, and Italy, without firing a gun. The other debate, which was with the King of Ashantee, was held with the King of Ashantee, who enjoys human sacrifices, and can keep only 3,333 lawful wives at any one time. His Majesty, who used to wear feathers as he sat on his golden stool, surrendered without a fight, and the British expedition which was sent against him kept guard over his capital, while he is a prisoner.

Besides all these things, England has been, if she is not yet, exchanging notes with Brazil as to the ownership of the island of Trinidad; and there have been rumors that she has made remarks to

Argentina upon questions of finance and upon cash. It is not long since several English cannon were pointed at Nicaragua. While yet those cannon were loaded, England had thoughts about the war between Japan and China, and also about the probable results of Russian maneuvering in Korea and Manchuria.

England is pretty busy most of the time. She has just fixed up things in Siam to the satisfaction of France, which had spoken to her with emphasis about that country. She is not perfectly happy in Egypt. There must be at least a hundred cases which may give her trouble at any time. She refuses, for example, to accede to Italy's wishes in regard to Abyssinia.

Lord SALISBURY has a rough time all around the world. He may yet have reason to fear more than he fears some other adversaries the unrestrainable GLADSTONE, who is now in the 87th year of his age and full of fire.

Mr. Markham's Views.

We find in the columns of the London *Times* a long letter from Mr. CLEMENTS R. MARKHAM, President of the Royal Geographical Society, purporting to set forth the results of his researches among the maps of that society relating to the Venezuelan boundary line.

The general spirit of Mr. MARKHAM seems to be that of the attorney rather than of the geographer, and akin to that of Mr. ALFRED AUSTIN. He begins by talking of the "honorable character of the Venezuelan claim," and undertakes to assuage such maps as support that claim, while lauding the contrary maps. A part of what he says of SCHOMBURGK's performances may give a clue to the value of his work:

"He explored the Waimai and Barima, and delineated a boundary by which a large extent of British territory, comprising the whole valley of the Yurari, was given up to Venezuela. Even then the Venetians had conducted themselves with remarkable courtesy to British territory, and the line was designed to satisfy them and to secure a good understanding, a fruitless attempt."

"The line was drawn on a just and well-defined principle, according to Venezuela the Yurari valley, which had been lawfully occupied by the Venetians, and retaining the territory which had never been occupied by Spaniards or Venezuelans, and to which they have no right."

"This concession of British territory shows that nothing could have been further from the thoughts of English statesmen than an infringement of the Monroe doctrine."

There is more to this effect, but not a syllable about the point of consequence, such as *per se* drawn in the boundary dispute, even if it seeks to "satisfy" Venezuela, can bind the latter or have any standing in international law.

The Sceptical general conclusion of Mr. MARKHAM is also worth quoting:

"It will have been seen, from the evidence of maps, that Spain had no claim to British Guiana, that Venezuela, therefore, inherits no claim, and that even if the territory was adjudged not to belong to Great Britain it in no way follows that it belongs to Venezuela."

If this is a specimen of the British evidence to be laid before the High Commission, we fear that body will not be greatly aided from British sources in its duties.

From Jurisprudence to Arithmetic.

JURIST JOHN RAINES of Canandaigua-by-the-Lake is a statesman of bright and burlesqued intellect, a profound philosopher, a far-seeing statesman, a daring political guide, and a courageous chieftain. Where he leads, the Republican party of New York follows—if it happens to be going that way. Mr. RAINES has recently issued a bulletin designed to show some of the novelties of what may be called Canandaigua arithmetic, involving a summary suspension of some of the fundamental laws of the science of numbers, whereby geometry gets an undercut, algebra is blown to bits, and the ordinary rules of computation a veritable knock-down smash. The RAINES bulletin refers to the revenues which would come from the adoption of the RAINES excise bill, so-called, and this learned statesman, whose knowledge of the law he allows no man to dispute, establishes one or two new propositions in arithmetic.

At the present time, as for many years past, the net revenues arising from liquor licenses imposed in New York go where they belong, to the city treasury and to local objects and institutions. Under the RAINES excise bill, so-called, one-half of the sum of such revenues is to go to the city hereafter and the other half to the State Government in Albany. Naturally, one might infer, this subdivision of revenues would be an injury to the city of New York and a benefit to the rural districts, in view of the case which is further enforced by the fact that the New Yorkers in Albany and here are opposing the bill, while the representatives of country districts in Albany are favoring it. But RAINES says in the bulletin which he has issued that if the revenue from liquor licenses in New York be divided in two, the half under the terms of his bill would be greater than the present sum total under the regulations established by the bill now in force, which was passed by a Democratic Legislature and signed by a Democratic Governor in 1892.

RAINES avers that by raising the license fee from \$250 per year, the present rate, to \$800 there will be an automatic reduction in the number of saloons of 40 per cent. But although the number of saloons will be thus reduced, the increase of the license fee will be enough to make the total revenue larger than heretofore, even though the city of New York is compelled to divide one-half of this revenue with the fiscal representatives in Albany of Liberty Corners, Bath-by-the-Lake, Half Moon, Stillwater, White Creek Junction, Schroeppel, Smyrna Turnpike, and Bug's Bend. He figures as follows:

In New York 6,000 saloons now pay \$250. \$1,500,000
A deduction of 40 per cent. in the number of saloons would leave 3,600 at \$800. 2,880,000
One-half for rural and interior counties. 1,440,000

Loss to New York city. \$600,000

But RAINES declares that as the city of New York pays, "as we are told over and over again," 45 per cent. of the State taxes, why, obviously enough, New York would get back 45 per cent. of its quota of appropriation to the general fund in Albany.

It would not! Money sent from this city to Albany which passes officially or semi-officially through the hands of rural Republican legislators never comes back. It is an ebb tide to which there is no flow. The rural legislators always find uses for such money, and they rigidly prevent its return to the public treasury in New York. If any misguided citizen of this town, deluded by RAINES's arithmetic, should imagine that any share of the rural grab of New York city's excise revenues will come back, like bread upon the waters, after many days, his credulous confidence will be soon shaken and his hopes blasted. No! New York city would lose, and lose heavily, if compelled to divide its excise revenues with Albany; and the computations of RAINES do not disguise this fact. "Citizens of New York should also remember," says the friend of Jurisprudence and of revolutionary Arithmetic, "that this is not money taken from the city treasury, for without

this bill it would remain just where it is now." Such is the argument of RAINES.

We do not know what warrant RAINES may have for determining that the adoption of his excise bill would reduce by 40 per cent. the number of licensed liquor saloons in New York. When the BROOKS high license law was adopted in Pennsylvania there were 5,000 saloons in Philadelphia, and when the law had gone into operation the number was reduced to 1,600, a much more radical decrease than the upset figure of 40 per cent. stated by RAINES. But currently with this decrease in the number of licensed saloons, there was an increase in Philadelphia of 500,000 in the number of "speak-easies," which, now number, it is computed, some 1,500 of all grades. Speak-easies, of course, pay no license, high or low, to the city treasury of Philadelphia or the State treasury in Harrisburg, and it does not seem unreasonable to infer that the adoption of the RAINES bill here, like the BROOKS bill in Philadelphia, will be a signal for the opening of speak-easies in New York, especially in view of the fact that the present wine and ale saloons, which number about 500 and pay \$75 a year for the privilege of selling beer and light wines only, are to be charged \$800 a year by the RAINES bill. RAINES, who has probably never been on one of the side streets of New York, some of which need a close resemblance to Main street in Canandaigua, on which RAINES walks when at home, followed by a crowd of farmers, hucksters, and small boys. One trouble with RAINES is that he knows too much to be in Albany. He ought to be in Washington.

The End of the Seals.

The conclusion said practically to have been reached by the Senate Foreign Committee to report favorably the bill relating to the fur seals makes its passage not improbable. Last year a similar bill passed the House under a two-thirds vote suspending the rules for the purpose, but in the Senate no action was taken upon it, perhaps with a view of trying an appeal to England for seal protection. That appeal, made by Mr. GRESHAM, proved fruitless.

The pending bill provides for asking Great Britain, Russia, and Japan to join in a commission to arrange for giving the fur seals better protection, and meanwhile to agree to the point of consequence, such as *per se* drawn in the boundary dispute, even if it seeks to "satisfy" Venezuela, can bind the latter or have any standing in international law.

The Sceptical general conclusion of Mr. MARKHAM is also worth quoting: "It will have been seen, from the evidence of maps, that Spain had no claim to British Guiana, that Venezuela, therefore, inherits no claim, and that even if the territory was adjudged not to belong to Great Britain it in no way follows that it belongs to Venezuela."

If this is a specimen of the British evidence to be laid before the High Commission, we fear that body will not be greatly aided from British sources in its duties.

From Jurisprudence to Arithmetic.

JURIST JOHN RAINES of Canandaigua-by-the-Lake is a statesman of bright and burlesqued intellect, a profound philosopher, a far-seeing statesman, a daring political guide, and a courageous chieftain. Where he leads, the Republican party of New York follows—if it happens to be going that way. Mr. RAINES has recently issued a bulletin designed to show some of the novelties of what may be called Canandaigua arithmetic, involving a summary suspension of some of the fundamental laws of the science of numbers, whereby geometry gets an undercut, algebra is blown to bits, and the ordinary rules of computation a veritable knock-down smash. The RAINES bulletin refers to the revenues which would come from the adoption of the RAINES excise bill, so-called, and this learned statesman, whose knowledge of the law he allows no man to dispute, establishes one or two new propositions in arithmetic.

At the present time, as for many years past, the net revenues arising from liquor licenses imposed in New York go where they belong, to the city treasury and to local objects and institutions. Under the RAINES excise bill, so-called, one-half of the sum of such revenues is to go to the city hereafter and the other half to the State Government in Albany. Naturally, one might infer, this subdivision of revenues would be an injury to the city of New York and a benefit to the rural districts, in view of the case which is further enforced by the fact that the New Yorkers in Albany and here are opposing the bill, while the representatives of country districts in Albany are favoring it. But RAINES says in the bulletin which he has issued that if the revenue from liquor licenses in New York be divided in two, the half under the terms of his bill would be greater than the present sum total under the regulations established by the bill now in force, which was passed by a Democratic Legislature and signed by a Democratic Governor in 1892.

RAINES avers that by raising the license fee from \$250 per year, the present rate, to \$800 there will be an automatic reduction in the number of saloons of 40 per cent. But although the number of saloons will be thus reduced, the increase of the license fee will be enough to make the total revenue larger than heretofore, even though the city of New York is compelled to divide one-half of this revenue with the fiscal representatives in Albany of Liberty Corners, Bath-by-the-Lake, Half Moon, Stillwater, White Creek Junction, Schroeppel, Smyrna Turnpike, and Bug's Bend. He figures as follows:

In New York 6,000 saloons now pay \$250. \$1,500,000
A deduction of 40 per cent. in the number of saloons would leave 3,600 at \$800. 2,880,000
One-half for rural and interior counties. 1,440,000

Loss to New York city. \$600,000

But RAINES declares that as the city of New York pays, "as we are told over and over again," 45 per cent. of the State taxes, why, obviously enough, New York would get back 45 per cent. of its quota of appropriation to the general fund in Albany.

It would not! Money sent from this city to Albany which passes officially or semi-officially through the hands of rural Republican legislators never comes back. It is an ebb tide to which there is no flow. The rural legislators always find uses for such money, and they rigidly prevent its return to the public treasury in New York. If any misguided citizen of this town, deluded by RAINES's arithmetic, should imagine that any share of the rural grab of New York city's excise revenues will come back, like bread upon the waters, after many days, his credulous confidence will be soon shaken and his hopes blasted. No! New York city would lose, and lose heavily, if compelled to divide its excise revenues with Albany; and the computations of RAINES do not disguise this fact. "Citizens of New York should also remember," says the friend of Jurisprudence and of revolutionary Arithmetic, "that this is not money taken from the city treasury, for without

this bill it would remain just where it is now." Such is the argument of RAINES.

We do not know what warrant RAINES may have for determining that the adoption of his excise bill would reduce by 40 per cent. the number of licensed liquor saloons in New York. When the BROOKS high license law was adopted in Pennsylvania there were 5,000 saloons in Philadelphia, and when the law had gone into operation the number was reduced to 1,600, a much more radical decrease than the upset figure of 40 per cent. stated by RAINES. But currently with this decrease in the number of licensed saloons, there was an increase in Philadelphia of 500,000 in the number of "speak-easies," which, now number, it is computed, some 1,500 of all grades. Speak-easies, of course, pay no license, high or low, to the city treasury of Philadelphia or the State treasury in Harrisburg, and it does not seem unreasonable to infer that the adoption of the RAINES bill here, like the BROOKS bill in Philadelphia, will be a signal for the opening of speak-easies in New York, especially in view of the fact that the present wine and ale saloons, which number about 500 and pay \$75 a year for the privilege of selling beer and light wines only, are to be charged \$800 a year by the RAINES bill. RAINES, who has probably never been on one of the side streets of New York, some of which need a close resemblance to Main street in Canandaigua, on which RAINES walks when at home, followed by a crowd of farmers, hucksters, and small boys. One trouble with RAINES is that he knows too much to be in Albany. He ought to be in Washington.

The End of the Seals.

The conclusion said practically to have been reached by the Senate Foreign Committee to report favorably the bill relating to the fur seals makes its passage not improbable. Last year a similar bill passed the House under a two-thirds vote suspending the rules for the purpose, but in the Senate no action was taken upon it, perhaps with a view of trying an appeal to England for seal protection. That appeal, made by Mr. GRESHAM, proved fruitless.

The pending bill provides for asking Great Britain, Russia, and Japan to join in a commission to arrange for giving the fur seals better protection, and meanwhile to agree to the point of consequence, such as *per se* drawn in the boundary dispute, even if it seeks to "satisfy" Venezuela, can bind the latter or have any standing in international law.

From Jurisprudence to Arithmetic.

JURIST JOHN RAINES of Canandaigua-by-the-Lake is a statesman of bright and burlesqued intellect, a profound philosopher, a far-seeing statesman, a daring political guide, and a courageous chieftain. Where he leads, the Republican party of New York follows—if it happens to be going that way. Mr. RAINES has recently issued a bulletin designed to show some of the novelties of what may be called Canandaigua arithmetic, involving a summary suspension of some of the fundamental laws of the science of numbers, whereby geometry gets an undercut, algebra is blown to bits, and the ordinary rules of computation a veritable knock-down smash. The RAINES bulletin refers to the revenues which would come from the adoption of the RAINES excise bill, so-called, and this learned statesman, whose knowledge of the law he allows no man to dispute, establishes one or two new propositions in arithmetic.

At the present time, as for many years past, the net revenues arising from liquor licenses imposed in New York go where they belong, to the city treasury and to local objects and institutions. Under the RAINES excise bill, so-called, one-half of the sum of such revenues is to go to the city hereafter and the other half to the State Government in Albany. Naturally, one might infer, this subdivision of revenues would be an injury to the city of New York and a benefit to the rural districts, in view of the case which is further enforced by the fact that the New Yorkers in Albany and here are opposing the bill, while the representatives of country districts in Albany are favoring it. But RAINES says in the bulletin which he has issued that if the revenue from liquor licenses in New York be divided in two, the half under the terms of his bill would be greater than the present sum total under the regulations established by the bill now in force, which was passed by a Democratic Legislature and signed by a Democratic Governor in 1892.

RAINES avers that by raising the license fee from \$250 per year, the present rate, to \$800 there will be an automatic reduction in the number of saloons of 40 per cent. But although the number of saloons will be thus reduced, the increase of the license fee will be enough to make the total revenue larger than heretofore, even though the city of New York is compelled to divide one-half of this revenue with the fiscal representatives in Albany of Liberty Corners, Bath-by-the-Lake, Half Moon, Stillwater, White Creek Junction, Schroeppel, Smyrna Turnpike, and Bug's Bend. He figures as follows:

In New York 6,000 saloons now pay \$250. \$1,500,000
A deduction of 40 per cent. in the number of saloons would leave 3,600 at \$800. 2,880,000
One-half for rural and interior counties. 1,440,000

Loss to New York city. \$600,000

But RAINES declares that as the city of New York pays, "as we are told over and over again," 45 per cent. of the State taxes, why, obviously enough, New York would get back 45 per cent. of its quota of appropriation to the general fund in Albany.

It would not! Money sent from this city to Albany which passes officially or semi-officially through the hands of rural Republican legislators never comes back. It is an ebb tide to which there is no flow. The rural legislators always find uses for such money, and they rigidly prevent its return to the public treasury in New York. If any misguided citizen of this town, deluded by RAINES's arithmetic, should imagine that any share of the rural grab of New York city's excise revenues will come back, like bread upon the waters, after many days, his credulous confidence will be soon shaken and his hopes blasted. No! New York city would lose, and lose heavily, if compelled to divide its excise revenues with Albany; and the computations of RAINES do not disguise this fact. "Citizens of New York should also remember," says the friend of Jurisprudence and of revolutionary Arithmetic, "that this is not money taken from the city treasury, for without

this bill it would remain just where it is now." Such is the argument of RAINES.

We do not know what warrant RAINES may have for determining that the adoption of his excise bill would reduce by 40 per cent. the number of licensed liquor saloons in New York. When the BROOKS high license law was adopted in Pennsylvania there were 5,000 saloons in Philadelphia, and when the law had gone into operation the number was reduced to 1,600, a much more radical decrease than the upset figure of 40 per cent. stated by RAINES. But currently with this decrease in the number of licensed saloons, there was an increase in Philadelphia of 500,000 in the number of "speak-easies," which, now number, it is computed, some 1,500 of all grades. Speak-easies, of course, pay no license, high or low, to the city treasury of Philadelphia or the State treasury in Harrisburg, and it does not seem unreasonable to infer that the adoption of the RAINES bill here, like the BROOKS bill in Philadelphia, will be a signal for the opening of speak-easies in New York, especially in view of the fact that the present wine and ale saloons, which number about 500 and pay \$75 a year for the privilege of selling beer and light wines only, are to be charged \$800 a year by the RAINES bill. RAINES, who has probably never been on one of the side streets of New York, some of which need a close resemblance to Main street in Canandaigua, on which RAINES walks when at home, followed by a crowd of farmers, hucksters, and small boys. One trouble with RAINES is that he knows too much to be in Albany. He ought to be in Washington.

He ought to be in Washington.

not suffered any serious injury on either occasion. They called one of the ophthalmic surgeons of the London Hospital, and another medical man, who had examined the plaintiff, who expressed the opinion that there was a natural want of symmetry between the plaintiff's eyes, of which she was endeavoring to take advantage. There was also evidence tending to prove that the tremor of the arm was shammed.

Now, when the Lord Chief Justice came to charge the jury on the case thus developed, he took the side of the plaintiff in a manner that would be regarded by most American lawyers as equivalent to a direction to find a verdict in favor of the plaintiff. To illustrate the extent to which he indicated his own view of the credibility of the witnesses and his idea of the conclusions which the jury ought to reach, we will give the charge as reported in the London *Times*, noting in italics those portions in which the Lord Chief Justice most manifestly acted the part of the thirteenth jurymen:

"The Lord Chief Justice, addressing the jury, said that it was a serious case. The defendants had sought to bring to the attention of the jury a charge of conspiracy against a number of persons, including the plaintiff and her family, Dr. HAMILTON, and several others. It was said that she had taken advantage of the fact that an accident happened in 1886 to vamp up a case which had been tried in 1884. It was suggested that, even if there was an accident, it did not appear to be a serious one, and that the present signs, if any, which he noticed in the plaintiff's eyes, were the result of a most respectable person, including the plaintiff and her family, Dr. HAMILTON, and several others. It was said that she had taken advantage of the fact that an accident happened in 1886 to vamp up a case which had been tried in 1884. It was suggested that, even if there was an accident, it did not appear to be a serious one, and that the present signs, if any, which he noticed in the plaintiff's eyes, were the result of a most respectable person, including the plaintiff and her family, Dr. HAMILTON, and several others. It was said that she had taken advantage of the fact that an accident happened in 1886 to vamp up a case which had been tried in 1884. It was suggested that, even if there was an accident, it did not appear to be a serious one, and that the present signs, if any, which he noticed in the plaintiff's eyes, were the result of a most respectable person, including the plaintiff and her family, Dr. HAMILTON, and several others. It was said that she had taken advantage of the fact that an accident happened in 1886 to vamp up a case which had been tried in 1884. It was suggested that, even if there was an accident, it did not appear to be a serious one, and that the present signs, if any, which he noticed in the plaintiff's eyes, were the result of a most respectable person, including the plaintiff and her family, Dr. HAMILTON, and several others. It was said that she had taken advantage of the fact that an accident happened in 1886 to vamp up a case which had been tried in 1884. It was suggested that, even if there was an accident, it did not appear to be a serious one, and that the present signs, if any, which he noticed in the plaintiff's eyes, were the result of a most respectable person, including the plaintiff and her family, Dr. HAMILTON, and several others. It was said that she had taken advantage of the fact that an accident happened in 1886 to vamp up a case which had been tried in 1884. It was suggested that, even if there was an accident, it did not appear to be a serious one, and that the present signs, if any, which he noticed in the plaintiff's eyes, were the result of a most respectable person, including the plaintiff and her family, Dr. HAMILTON, and several others. It was said that she had taken advantage of the fact that an accident happened in 1886 to vamp up a case which had been tried in 1884. It was suggested that, even if there was an accident, it did not appear to be a serious one, and that the present signs, if any, which he noticed in the plaintiff's eyes, were the result of a most respectable person, including the plaintiff and her family, Dr. HAMILTON, and several others. It was said that she had taken advantage of the fact that an accident happened in 1886 to vamp up a case which had been tried in 1884. It was suggested that, even if there was an accident, it did not appear to be a serious one, and that the present signs, if any, which he noticed in the plaintiff's eyes, were the result of a most respectable person, including the plaintiff and her family, Dr. HAMILTON, and several others. It was said that she had taken advantage of the fact that an accident happened in 1886 to vamp up a case which had been tried in 1884. It was suggested that, even if there was an accident, it did not appear to be a serious one, and that the present signs, if any, which he noticed in the plaintiff's eyes, were the result of a most respectable person, including the plaintiff and her family, Dr. HAMILTON, and several others. It was said that she had taken advantage of the fact that an accident happened in 1886 to